LIBRARY OF THE

FACTS ON FILE
WORLD NEWS DIGEST WITH INDEX

Reg. U.S. Pat. Off.
Vol. XIV, No. 726

Published Weekly

September 24-30, 1954

Week in Headlines

International

London Conf. approached accord on West German rearmament.

U.S. told UN it would push Eisenhower atomic pool plan despite Soviet non-cooperation.

Polish ex-police agent shed light on Noel Field mystery.

1,168 persons lost in Japanese ferryboat sinking during typhoon.

United States

Watkins Com. recommended Senate censure of McCarthy.

Nixon's remarks on GOP cleanup of loyalty & security risks in Govt. provoked campaign controversy.

Atom sub Nautilus joined fleet.

2 ex-PWs convicted of collaborating with Reds in Korea.

Delaware town abandoned attempt at school desegregation.

Died: Sen. Pat McCarran.

WORLD AFFAIRS

WEST EUROPE

Germans in Arms Plan
London Parley Drafts Pact

Tentative agreement on a new plan to bring West German forces into NATO was reported Sept. 30 at a 9-nation foreign ministers' conference in London. A British spokesman said the conferees were "over the hump" in their efforts to draft a replacement for EDC.

The plan on which the ministers were said to have reached an agreement in principle:

- Expand the 1948 Brussels Treaty to include West Germany & Italy as well as Britain, France, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg; create an "arms pool" by those countries.
- Establishment of a joint commission by the 7 Brussels powers, the U.S. & Canada to control arms manufacture in their countries.
- Assignment of broader powers to the Supreme Allied (NATO) Commander in Europe over use & supply of national army units under his command.
- Entry of West Germany into NATO as soon as the revised Brussels treaty, with its new control provisions, took effect.

These proposals were said to have satisfied French demands for safeguards against German aggression and German demands for sovereignty equal to that of other NATO members. One condition remaining to be met: France's demand that its dispute with Germany over the Saar be settled before the arms plan took effect. France apparently had received another assurance it wanted: that the U.S. & Britain would continue to keep forces in Europe on a long-term basis.[1]

Delegations to the London conference, which began Sept. 28 & was held in Lancaster House, were headed by U.S. State Secy. John Foster Dulles, British Forgn. Secy. Anthony Eden (named conference chairman Sept. 28), French Premier-Forgn. Min. Pierre Mendès-France, West German Chancellor-Forgn. Min. Konrad Adenauer, Italian Forgn. Min. Gaetano Martino, Canadian External Affairs Secy. Lester B. Pearson, Belgian Forgn. Min. Paul-Henri Spaak, Netherlands co-Forgn. Min. J. W. Beyen & Luxembourg Premier-Forgn. Min. Joseph Bech. They assigned consulting experts Sept. 30 to perfect details of the new plan.

Pre-Conference Developments

The U.S. Govt.'s view that West Europeans must devise a plan to use all their defensive resources was reflected in pre-conference statements by Defense Secy. Charles E. Wilson & Dulles.

Wilson declared at a news conference in Washington Sept. 23: "I don't think there is anything we can do to hold Europe" unless "the Europeans . . . want to hold their own countries & keep them free."[4]

Dulles, on leaving Washington to fly to London Sept. 25: Failure of EDC raised doubt that a "sovereign & equal" West Germany would be permitted to contribute to "the common defense" and that West European states would "achieve a high degree of military, economic & political unity among themselves." The U.S. no longer sought "security through isolation" but could not "gamble (on) programs that have no reasonable prospect of providing genuine security." "The feasibility of the whole collective security program must be reexamined." But rather than chiding France for its rejection of EDC, Dulles complimented France & Britain for taking the "initiative" in trying to work out an acceptable substitute for the EDC plan.[5]

Adenauer sent the London Conf. Govts. a memorandum Sept. 23 declaring his readiness to negotiate an agreement to rearm West Germany on condition that it be made a fully sovereign & equal member of the Brussels & NATO treaty groups. He said the question of West German sovereignty should be settled first in the London talks. (His statement evoked much political criticism in West Germany because he had not first asked the Bonn Parliament to indorse his policy.)[2]

The existing 6-nation Brussels Treaty Org.'s Permanent Comm. completed work in Brussels Sept. 24 on a proposed redraft of the Brussels pact to allow for admission of West Germany & Italy. The commission submitted its work to the London Conf.[6]

Meantime, the advisory European Assembly in Strasbourg, completing Sept. 24 a 2-week session, recommended by 65-8 (13 abstentions) Sept. 24 that (a) Germany & Italy be brought into a defense organization with Britain, France & the Benelux nations or (b) attempts be made to put through a new EDC-like plan should the London Conf. fail.[7]

Dulles, who had avoided stopping in Paris when he visited Europe 10 days previously,[8] held a private talk with Mendès-France in London Sept. 27. They were said to have determined that they were "not very far apart in principles" on rearming West Germany.

★ ★ ★

Germans Stress Unification

The West German Free Dem. Party, 2d to Christian Dems. in the Adenauer governing coalition, issued a statement Sept. 28 demanding that West Germany have the right to negotiate a reunion with East Germany without foreign approval. The FDP thus adopted a line similar to that of Social Dems. (Socialists) who opposed Chancellor Adenauer's policy of stressing a Western arms alliance over German unity.[2]

Franz Von Papen, pre-Nazi German Chancellor & a leading diplomat during the Hitlerian regime, advocated in a booklet *(Europe, What Now?)* published Sept. 27 that Germany be reunified in a "neutralized Central European bloc" allied neither to West nor East. Neutralism previously had been advocated by ex-Chancellor Heinrich Bruening, Hans Luther, Jos. Wirth.[3]

★ ★ ★

ADVISORY BOARD

Letters: Prof. A. J BARNOUW, Columbia
Medical Science: Dr. EDWARD C. BRENNER
Political Science: Prof. FRANCIS W. COKER, Yale
Economics: Prof. J. ANTON DE HAAS, Claremont
Science: DAVID DIETZ, Scripps-Howard Newspapers
Education: Dr. HARRY D. GIDEONSE, Pres. B'klyn Coll
History: JOHN GUNTHER
News Analysis: H. V. KALTENBORN
World Affairs: WILLIAM L. SHIRER
Law: Dr. FRANK HENRY SOMMERS, formerly N.Y.U.
Latin America: Prof. FRANK TANNENBAUM, Columbia
Library Service: Dr. C. C. WILLIAMSON, Columbia

1—see p. 313C1 2—see pp. 313C1, 308A3 3—see Vol. XIII, p. 303C3; Vol. IX, p. 37H 4—see Vol. XIII, p. 356E1 5—see p. 313D1-G2 6—see p. 313B2 7—see p. 313B-C2 8—see p. 306D3 9—see p. 313C1-G2

Laborites Divide on Bonn

A resolution indorsing rearmament of West Germany within the Western alliance was passed by a narrow majority Sept. 28 in the annual British Labor Party Conf. in Scarborough, Eng. Delegates representing 3,270,000 party members voted for it. Those representing 3,022,000 were opposed. Ex-Prime Min. Clement R. Attlee & his deputy party leader, Herbert Morrison, led debate in favor of the resolution against spokesmen for the minority led by Aneurin Bevan.

Bevan was defeated, 2-1, by Hugh Gaitskell for Labor Party treasurer. In running for treasurer, Bevan gave up his seat on the party's Natl. Executive Com., thus became free to criticize its policy actions. He predicted in the leftist Laborite magazine *Tribune* Sept. 23, on the basis of his recent visit to Moscow, that Soviet leaders henceforth would be easier to deal with because they were "on top of their domestic situation" and "any agreements they make . . . will not be accounted to them as weakness."[1]

Ministers Near Accord

First-day sessions of the London Conf. Sept. 28 were highlighted by statements in which: (1) Eden[9] warned that the parley "must succeed." (2) Mendès-France said he liked the news Brussels Treaty plan better than EDC but that there must be a provision for controlling the armaments of every country in the alliance. Mendès also said it was "essential" that the Franco-German dispute over the Saar be settled before Germany entered the Western alliance.[2]

Adenauer told the conference Sept. 28 that Germany would: rearm only under the Brussels & NATO pacts; accept the EDC-proposed limit of 12 divisions on its army or other limits recommended from year to year by the NATO Council; abstain, because of West Germany's vulnerable strategic position, from making atomic, chemical, bacterial & guided-missiles weapons. He recognized that the Allied occupation powers would retain their rights in connection with a German peace treaty & unification even though the West German state became a sovereign partner in the Western military alliance.[3]

Dulles, Eden Give Pledges

The continental countries in the conference were promised full U.S. & British military support Sept. 29 if they would act to strengthen Europe's unified defense.

Dulles made this statement as to American forces in Europe: The U.S. Constitution limited a President's authority to commit a quota of armed forces to a foreign area. But if U.S. Govt. policy made it advisable to maintain troops in a certain place it was "extremely unlikely that the allocation of forces would be altered." The U.S. could not renew to Europe the pledge of support given by the President to EDC countries Apr. 16* if no adequate substitute for EDC were adopted. However, "if the hopes that were tied into the EDC treaty can reasonably be transferred into arrangements which will be the outgrowth of this (London) meeting, I would certainly be disposed to recommend to the President that he should renew a pledge comparable to that which was offered in connection with the EDC treaty."[4]

Eden followed up Dulles' statement by promising that Britain, under the new Brussels Treaty plan, would not withdraw its 4 divisions & tactical air force from the continent "against the wishes of a majority of the Brussels treaty powers"—barring some "acute overseas emergency." If Britain found itself unable to pay the cost of maintaining its forces in Europe it would refer the problem to the NATO Council, Eden said.[5]

Delegation aides at the London conference said Dulles & Eden had satisfied French demands for assurance that American & British troops—potentially a restraining force against misuse of a new German army—would remain in Europe.[6]

*A promise to "maintain in Europe, including Germany" a force adequate to help insure North Atlantic defense. [See p. 127E1] 1—see pp. 299F1-B2, 117E2 2—p. 312E2 3—313C3 4—313D1 5—313C2 6—321C1-B2 7—299C2 8—267C2 9—pp. 216C2, 203C2 10—Vol. XII, 378G

OTHER WORLD NEWS

U.S. Pushes Atomic Pool

State Secy. John Foster Dulles, addressing the UN Gen. Assembly in New York Sept. 23, said the U.S. would proceed with its plans to set up an international atomic-energy program despite Russia's refusal to take part on acceptable terms. He said the pool plan first proposed by Pres. Eisenhower in Dec. 1953 would not be permitted to "languish" and remained open to "all nations interested in participating & willing to take on the responsibilities of membership." He said the U.S. would propose (1) an international scientific conference under UN auspices next spring to "consider this whole vast subject" of peaceful atomic energy, (2) establishment of a reactor training school in the U.S. early next year for students from throughout the world and (3) study by a "substantial number" of foreign medical & surgical experts in U.S. cancer hospitals where research was done on atomic energy techniques.[7]

Dulles said Russia, having learned that he would speak to the UN on the subject, had hurriedly sent the U.S. a note "yesterday" (Sept. 22) "affirming its readiness to talk further" about the Eisenhower plan. But the new note "gave no indication that the USSR had receded from its negative position," he reported. (The U.S. made public Sept. 25 its correspondence with Russia on the Eisenhower plan since Jan. 11. The documents revealed that the Russians never had yielded in their demand that a ban on use of atomic & other mass-destruction weapons be declared simultaneously with an agreement on peaceful development of atomic energy. The U.S. still maintained that military & peaceful use of the atom involved different questions and an unenforced "ban" on atomic weapons would play into the hands of an aggressor.)[8]

Book Stirs H-Bomb Dispute

An effort by U.S. Atomic Energy Comm. Chrmn. Lewis L. Strauss to forestall publication Sept. 30 of *The Hydrogen Bomb* (244 pp., McKay, $3) was disclosed Sept. 26 by co-author James R. Shepley, *Time* Washington bureau chief, & confirmed by Strauss. Shepley & Clay Blair Jr., *Time's* Defense Dept. correspondent, charged in the book that Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer & other leading atomic scientists tried to thwart the eventually-successful efforts of Dr. Edward Teller to get an American H-bomb into production. The book said Russia took a temporary atomic lead over the U.S. in 1953, due mostly to Oppenheimer. Shepley said Strauss offered to "buy the manuscript" & withhold it for 25 yrs., or until "most of the individuals concerned are dead," in order to "shield his scientists from public controversy." Ex-AEC Chrmn. Gordon Dean denounced the book's H-bomb history Sept. 29 as "vicious" and "untrue."[9]

Polish Exile Tells of Fields

The U.S. disclosed Sept. 28 that Jozef Swiatlo, 39, a former deputy department chief of the Polish State Security Ministry (Political Police), had been in U.S. custody since fleeing to West Berlin Dec. 5 & had been granted asylum.

Swiatlo gave in a news conference in Washington Sept. 28 these details of the fate of Noel, Herta & Hermann Field, Americans missing 5 years:

Swiatlo personally arrested Hermann Field at Warsaw airport in Aug. 1949 when Field was en route to Prague in search of his brother Noel, ex-U.S. State Dept. official who had vanished there. Hermann was imprisoned near Warsaw with no news of his wife & children. He went on hunger strikes, tried to commit suicide in 1951. Hermann, Noel & Herta (Mrs. Noel) Field, believed in the U.S. to be Communist sympathizers, were accused in Warsaw & Budapest of Titoism & of being "American imperialist spies." The Noel Fields were imprisoned in Budapest. (Noel's adopted daughter, Mrs. Erika Glaser Wallach, disappeared in East Berlin in Aug. 1950.)

The U.S. sent notes to Hungary & Poland Sept. 28 demanding release of Hermann, Noel & Herta Field, but Swiatlo said Sept. 29 he suspected all 3 were dead.[10]

FACTS ON FILE is published weekly by Facts on File, Inc., 516 Fifth Ave., New York 36, N. Y. (MUrray Hill 2-5523-4). Entered as 2d class matter June 24, 1941 at the Post Office in New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription $70 a year; Yearbooks (bound volumes) from 1941—$25 each. Cumulative Index published twice a month. Copyright 1954 by Facts on File, Inc. Edw. Van Westerborg, Pres.-Treas.; Fred McGhee, Secy.-Editor; C. M. Schwartz, Business Manager.

McCARTHY

Watkins Com. Urges Censure

A select Senate committee recommended unanimously Sept. 27 that the Senate censure Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy (R., Wis.) for contempt of the Senate Privileges & Elections Subcom. and for unwarranted abuse of Brig. Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker.[1] (The committee report had been completed & given to the Govt. Printing Office Sept. 24. See digest of report below.

The committee, headed by Sen. Arthur V. Watkins, criticized McCarthy on the 3 remaining charges but did not recommend a censure vote on them. These were the charges that McCarthy (a) incited Govt. employes to give him classified data, (b) improperly used a confidential FBI paper and (c) abused fellow Senators. The committee of 3 Republicans & 3 Democrats noted that most items in this 3d category—abuse of Senators—had been covered in the charge of contempt of the Elections Subcom., for which it urged censure.

McCarthy said that if the Senate upheld the report, "it will have gone a long way toward abdication of its Constitutional right to investigate wrongdoings in the Executive departments." Although "I do not care whether I am censured or not," McCarthy declared, he pledged to "fight against establishing a precedent which will . . . assist any Admin. in power to cover up its misdeeds."

Senate to Act After Elections

Senate Majority Leader William F. Knowland (Calif.) announced Sept. 24 that the Senate would reconvene Nov. 8—after the Nov. 2 elections—to act on the censure report. He said this was to allow Senate action to "take place in an atmosphere free from pre-election tensions." Knowland said Senate Minority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson (Tex.) had been consulted about the reconvening date and had found it "agreeable to him."[2]

McCarthy's 'Position' Presented

McCarthy's attorney, Edward Bennett Williams, submitted to the Watkins Com. Sept. 30 "a bill of exceptions" as a "general outline of the position that we will take when the full matter is argued" in the Senate.

Williams' statement repeated arguments the Watkins Com. had rejected during the censure hearings. The statement said: (a) McCarthy could not be censured for conduct in a previous Congress; (b) Senators who knew of censurable acts in a previous Congress should have called them to the Senate's attention when McCarthy was seated for the new term; (c) nobody before had been punished for declining a Senate committee's invitation to appear; (d) McCarthy had said he would appear if ordered; (e) McCarthy "believes that the [Elections] Subcom. was acting in a most illegal & irregular manner"; (e) Daniel G. Buckley charged that "he had been summarily dismissed from the subcommittee staff" because he found facts favorable to McCarthy [McCarthy had testified that Buckley resigned[3]; McCarthy later hired Buckley for his Senate Investigations Subcom. staff, where he still was employed]; (f) Jack Poorbaugh resigned as a subcommittee staff investigator & Sen. Herman Welker (R., Ida.) as a subcommittee member because they considered the subcommittee "prejudicially unfair" to McCarthy; (g) McCarthy was denied the right to cross-examine; (h) never in Congressional history "has a member been censured for expressing his opinions on the conduct of a committee" or its individual members; (i) McCarthy was not permitted to cite precedents involving Senators; (j) Zwicker was an evasive & recalcitrant witness, and "vigorous, hard-hitting cross-examination, necessitated by [his] answers," should not be considered "a basis for the censure of the interrogator."

In rejecting the legality of the Elections Subcom., Williams declared: The parent Rules & Admin. Com. had no rules of its own regarding appointment of members to its subcommittees. Senate Parliamentarian Charles L. Watkins said "in a closed session before Sen. [Arthur] Watkins on Sept. 17, 1954 (a session of which neither Sen. McCarthy nor his counsel was notified) that 'unless the committee has regulations in contravention of the Senate rules, the Senate rules, wherever applicable, would govern its proceedings.'" Senate rules provide "that the members of all committees must be appointed by ballot." The Elections Subcom. became "an invalid committee when it lost its 3d member because [he] was never replaced in the manner prescribed. . . ."*

Williams' interpretation of some sections of the report, as indicated by his statement, seemed in variance with interpretations of committee members. Example: Williams said the committee recommended censuring McCarthy for rejecting an invitation to appear before the Elections Subcom. "& for severely criticizing the subcommittee & an individual member." Watkins said his committee had meant abuse of all members.[4]

Also subject to contrary interpretation was Williams' assertion that: "46 specific charges were leveled" at McCarthy; the Watkins Com. considered all; "it finds that 2 of them warrant censure"; "each of every one of the remaining charges was dismissed by the committee." (The committee had held hearings on 5 categories including 13 specific charges; it recommended censure on 2 "categories," not on 2 "specific charges"; specific charges from one of the remaining 3 categories were transferred to one of the categories on which censure was recommended; the committee held no hearings on the remaining 33 charges largely because it was not feasible to do so; it eliminated most of them with no judgment upon the merits of any particular charge.")[5]

Reaction to Censure Report

Few Senators were willing to comment immediately on the Watkins Com. report. Among those who would discuss it, censure was opposed by such pro-McCarthy Senators as Pat McCarran (D., Nev.) [who died Sept. 28], Everett M. Dirksen (R., Ill.), Herman Welker (R., Ida.), William E. Jenner (R., Ind.), Frank A. Barrett (R., Wyo.) & E. D. Crippa (R., Wyo.). Censure proposals were supported by anti-McCarthy Sens. Theodore F. Green (D., R.I.), Herbert H. Lehman (D., N.Y.), A. Willis Robertson (D., Va.) & Dennis Chavez (D., N.M.).

Jenner said Sept. 29 that, as chariman of a Senate Rules subcommittee studying proposals to reform committee investigations, he would invite Sen. Watkins to testify about such proposals in the Select Com. report.[6] He indicated that he wanted to ask why Watkins questioned the Senate Parliamentarian at a "one-man hearing" although Watkins' committee proposal to ban such procedures.*

*Parliamentarian Watkins had appeared unexpectedly when Williams was absent. Williams protested, so the Parliamentarian was recalled and Williams cross-examined him fully. Parliamentarian Watkins said on both occasions that he considered the Elections Subcom. legal. The questioning was done by Williams & Sen. Watkins while the committee worked in an adjoining room with the door open. [See p. 324A-B2

1—see p. 307A1 2—p. 284E1 3—p. 308E-G3 4—p. 324E2, B-C3 5—p. 326D-F2 6—p. 326B3 7—p. 300A-B3 8—p. 301E3

★ ★ ★

Report on McCarthy Censure Hearings

(Facts on File digest of 40,000-word report released Sept. 27 by Select Senate Com. to Study Censure Charges against Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy)

Report. The Select Com., having considered Senate Res. 301, to censure McCarthy, "recommends that the resolution be adopted with certain amendments."

Category I—Incidents of Contempt of the Senate or a Senatorial Committee

Charges. It was charged that McCarthy: (1) "refused repeated invitations to testify before" the Senate Privileges & Election Subcom.; (2) "declined to comply with a request by letter dated Nov. 21, 1952, from the chairman of the subcommittee to appear to supply information concerning . . . his activities" as a Senator; (3) "denounced the subcommittee and contemptuously refused to comply with its request"; (4) "continued to show his contempt for the Senate by failing to explain in any manner the 6 charges contained in the Hennings-Hayden-Hendrickson report."[7]

The Select Com. included in this category the charge that McCarthy "ridiculed & defamed" Sen. Robert C. Hendrickson (R., N.J.), a subcommittee member, by calling him "a living miracle without brains or guts."[8]

Evidence. According to evidence at the Select Com.'s hearings: (a) the subcommittee was investigating charges against McCarthy under Senate Res. 187, 82d Congress, 1st Session; (b) McCarthy was "invited to appear & testify . . . on 5 separate occasions" during 1951-52 "and formally requested to appear by letter & telegram of Nov. 21, 1952"; (c) McCarthy "could not appear at the times specified in the request because [he was] in Wisconsin"; (d) he did not appear to answer questions about his own conduct but did appear once to support his own charges against ex-Sen. William Benton (D., Conn.); (e) McCarthy accused this "official subcommittee" of wasting "public money for improper partisan purposes, of proceeding dishonestly, of aiding the cause of communism"; (f) McCarthy gave the press "an abusive & insulting statement concerning Sen. Hendrickson, calculated to wound a colleague, solely because Sen. Hendrickson was a member of the sub-

committee and performing services required by the Senate"; (g) Senate Res. 187 "was not voted upon," but when the subcommittee's jurisdiction "& the integrity of its members was attacked, the Senate . . . affirmed & ratified both" by a 60-0 vote.

Findings of Fact. Among facts found by the Select Com. from the evidence & testimony:

- McCarthy "did not say in any of the correspondence relating to the hearings & his appearance that he would not appear before the subcommittee unless he was ordered to do so, but testified that he so notified Chrmn. [Guy M.] Gillette [D., Ia.] orally."
- Ex-Chrmn. Carl Hayden (D., Ariz.) of the subcommittee's parent Rules & Admin. Com. decided, after consulting the Senate Parliamentarian, that the subcommittee could operate legally with 3 members after Gillette & Sen. Herman Welker (R., Ida.) resigned from the formerly 5-man panel. Hayden later appointed himself to the subcommittee when Sen. A. S. Mike Monroney (D., Okla.) resigned. All this was "consistent" with subcommittee practice "and did not violate any rule of the parent committee."[1]
- At the Select Com. hearings, McCarthy was "asked whether he had any evidence to support his written statements that the subcommittee was spending tens of thousands of dollars and as guilty as though engaged in picking the pockets of the taxpayers to turn the loot over to the Democratic Natl. Com." He "testified . . . that he had produced this evidence in letters to the subcommittee. . . . No such evidence appears in the letters."[2]
- "When asked whether he had any evidence that the subcommittee had spent tens of thousands of dollars illegally, Sen. McCarthy testified that 'they were spending a vast amount of money illegally, I don't know the exact figure.'"
- McCarthy testified that the subcommittee's queries about his activities "were 6 insulting questions asked by the committee—by a Senator, not by a legal committee. I answered his questions. I told him the answer was 'No.'" "(But note that the above answer was contained in a letter from Sen. McCarthy to Sen. [Thomas] Hennings [D., Mo.] . . . addressed to the latter as chairman of the subcommittee. . . .)"

Legal Questions. (1) "The Senate is a continuing body" and its business continues from session to session. (2) "The Senate has the power to censure a Senator for conduct occurring during his prior term as Senator." (3) "It was not necessary for Senate Res. 187 to be adopted by the Senate. . . . In the regular order of Senate business, after this resolution was introduced, it was referred by the President of the Senate, without a vote by the Senate, to the Com. on Rules & Admin." The Legislative Reorg. Act provided for such referral and authorized the committee to make such investigations. (4) "The Gillette-Hennings Subcom. on Privileges & Elections was not acting beyond its power or jurisdiction." The 60-0 Senate vote Apr. 10, 1952 "must be considered as an affirmance" that the subcommittee "was acting within its power & jurisdiction."[3] (5) "The Gillette-Hennings Subcom. on Privileges & Elections was a lawfully constituted committee." Senate Parliamentarian Charles L. Watkins testified, "with the approval of Sen. McCarthy & his counsel," that the subcommittee's legality was not affected by its membership changes.[4]

(6) "It was not necessary for the subcommittee to subpena Sen. McCarthy. . . . It is the opinion of the Select Com. that a request to appear," such as the Nov. 21, 1952 letter & telegram, "was sufficient." (7) "Sen. McCarthy was repeatedly invited to appear." (8) "It was the duty of Sen. McCarthy to accept the repeated invitations by the subcommittee and his failure to appear was obstructive of the processes of the Senate, for no formal order or subpena should be necessary to bring Senators before Senate committees when their own honor & the honor of the Senate are at issue."[5] (9) "The request of Nov. 21, 1952 to Sen. McCarthy to appear did not form a legal basis for contempt, but his reply of Dec. 1, 1952 [a denunciatory letter] was in itself contumacious in character."

(10) McCarthy's conduct toward the subcommittee "was contemptuous, independently of his failure to appear." The subcommittee chairmen's letters to McCarthy "were uniformly courteous & cooperative." But McCarthy's replies "are clearly contemptuous, disregarding entirely his duty to cooperate, ridiculing the subcommittee, accusing these committee officers of the Senate with dishonesty and impugning their motives and making it impossible for them to proceed in orderly fashion or to complete their duties." (11) McCarthy "did 'denounce'" the subcommittee "without justification." In regard to his attack on Hendrickson: Any Senator has the right to criticize or condemn Senate committees "in proper language." "But he has no right to impugn the motives of individual Senators responsible for official action nor to reflect upon their personal character for what official action they took" or "no Senator could have freedom of action to perform his assigned committee duties. If a Senator must first give consideration to whether an official action can be wantonly impugned . . . the processes of the Senate will be destroyed."

(12) "The conduct of Sen. McCarthy has been contumacious toward the Senate by failing to explain 3 of the questions raised in the subcommittee's report." These were the questions of whether (a) "funds collected to fight communism were diverted to other purposes inuring to his personal advantage"; (b) "certain of his official activities were motivated by self-interest," and (c) "certain of his activities in Senatorial campaigns involved violations of the law." (13) "The reelection of Sen. McCarthy in 1952 did not settle these matters" because (a) the Senate is a continuing body, (b) some questions "were not raised until after the election" and (c) the people of Wisconsin, merely by reelecting McCarthy, could not pass on a question that "the Senate alone" could settle.

Conclusions. McCarthy's conduct toward the subcommittee, its members & the Senate "was contemptuous, contumacious & denunciatory without reason or justification and was obstructive to legislative processes. For this conduct, it is our recommendation that he be censured. . . ."

Category II—Incidents of Encouragement of U.S. Employes to Violate the Law & Their Oaths of Office or Executive Orders

Charges. It was charged that: (1 & 2) McCarthy, "before nationwide television, invited, urged & incited employes of the Govt. to violate the law & their oaths of office" and "to give him classified information"; (3) "the supplying of such classified information by such employes would be illegal, in violation of Presidential orders and contrary to the Constitutional rights of the Chief Executive."

Legal Issues. McCarthy claimed that (a) under U.S. Code (title V, sec. 652), "federal employes are not precluded from furnishing . . . to a member of Congress" information about "graft, corruption, Communist infiltration & espionage" and (b) by virtue of U.S. Code (title XVIII, sec. 4), "such employes have a duty to give such information."[6] The Select Com.'s study of these 2 provisions indicated, however, that (a) title V, sec. 652 did "no more than affirm that federal employes do not lose or forfeit any of their rights merely by virtue of their federal employment" and (b) title XVIII, sec. 4 applied "only to persons possessing actual personal knowledge of the actual commission of a felony as distinguished from information obtained by reviewing files."

Opinions of other Senators, cited by McCarthy, "are expressions of individuals and do not establish Senatorial precedent unless confirmed by official action."[7] Congress had the right to make appropriate investigations of the Executive Branch. The President may safeguard "information affecting . . . national defense notwithstanding that [this] might indirectly interfere with any secret transmission line between the Executive employes & any individual member of Congress. But the President, we think, cannot (nor do we believe he has sought by any order or directive called to our attention) deny to the Congress . . . any information, even though classified, if it discloses corruption or subversion in the Executive Branch."[8]

Because of the "ambiguity" of McCarthy's statements, they "are sus-

★ ★ ★

Censure Its Own Penalty

A Senate vote of censure against a Senator is an official, public condemnation of his actions but it brings no penalty other than its effect on public opinion.

★ ★ ★

1—see p. 309C3 2—300E3 3—301A3 4—309E3 5—308C3 6—308C1 7—308E1 8—310B2

ceptible of alternative constructions": (1) as merely an invitation to Govt. employes to bring him "information acquired by them in the ordinary course of their employment"; (2) as urging Govt. employes "to ransack confidential files . . . regardless of whether they had lawful access to those files, and bring him classified documents" which the Executive agencies had to keep confidential "to discover, prevent or bring to justice persons guilty" of corruption or subversion. "If his statements were susceptible of the 2d construction alone, Sen. McCarthy might well merit . . . censure." But "the Select Com. feels justified in giving Sen. McCarthy the benefit of the first or more charitable construction" under which it would be assumed that McCarthy was exercising his rightful powers.

After studying the Espionage Act, the Select Com. felt that McCarthy's statements "cannot assuredly be deemed . . . to constitute an incitement" to Govt. employes to violate the act.

Findings. Among the committee's findings: "The Select Com. is convinced" that McCarthy's invitation "was motivated by a sense of official duty and not uttered as the fruit of evil design or wrongful intent." But if federal employes acted on the invitation by supplying "classified material affecting the national security, the orderly & Constitutional functioning of the Executive & Legislative Branches . . . would be unduly disrupted & impeded, and this Select Com. warns such employes that such conduct involves the risk of effective penalties."

Conclusions. ". . . . The conduct of Sen. McCarthy in inviting federal employes to supply him with information without expressly excluding therefrom classified documents tends to create a disruption of the orderly & Constitutional functioning of the Executive & Legislative Branches . . . which tends to bring both into disrepute." It "cannot be condoned and is deemed improper." But the Select Com., "preferring to give Sen. McCarthy the benefit of whatever doubts . . . may have confused the issues, . . . does not feel justified in proposing his acts in this particular . . . as grounds for censure." The committee urged Senate & Executive leaders to meet "to clarify the mechanisms for obtaining such restricted information as Senate committees would find helpful in carrying out their . . . functions & responsibilities."

Category III—Incidents Involving Receipt or Use of Confidential or Classified Documents or Other Confidential Information from Executive Files

Charges. It was charged that McCarthy (1) "received & used confidential information unlawfully obtained from an Executive Dept. classified document and failed to restore the document," (2) in so doing, "was in possible violation of the Espionage Act" and (3) "offered such information to a Senate subcommittee in the form of a spurious document [McCarthy's '2¼-page FBI letter']."

Legal Issues. Congress recognized the need of authorizing Executive department heads "to make regulations relative to records & papers within their departments" and provided legislation for such authority as early as 1874. Presidential & Justice Dept. orders, issued under such legislation, provided for "classification" of security information and restricted dissemination of classified data outside the Executive Branch except as authorized by the Atty. General or top aides acting for him. Such legislation, including the Espionage Act, were "affirmative evidence of Congressional cooperation with the Executive . . . to discourage unauthorized disclosures of confidential documents or information relating to the national defense or obtained in the course of official duties and to prevent interference with or impairment of the loyalty or discipline of the armed forces."

McCarthy "knew in May 19, 1953, when he acquired the 2¼-page letter, . . . that it had been in part extracted from a document containing security information and, therefore, a classified document." McCarthy's counsel "admitted . . . that the material copied from a classified document retains the same classification as the document from which it is copied." McCarthy "contends that the deletion of certain information . . . renders it an unclassified document." His "position overlooks the legal necessity that declassification can only be effected by a legally constituted authority. Furthermore, the Atty. General has formally ruled that the document still contains security information. The [Select] committee, after examining the document, likewise has agreed that [it does]."

McCarthy's "disposition . . . to determine for himself what is or is not security information regardless of the evident classified marking on a document, confirmed by the opinion of a duly constituted agency authorized to make such a ruling, evidences a lack of regard for responsibility to the laws & regulations providing for orderly determination of such matters." His attitude was "disruptive of orderly governmental processes, violative of accepted comity between the 2 great branches of our Govt. . . . & incompatible with the basic tenets of effective democracy."

Findings. McCarthy "acted in the bona fide belief that the [2¼-page] document was a valid rather than a spurious instrument. . . ."[1]

Conclusions. ". . . In offering to make public the contents of this classified document, Sen. McCarthy committed grave error. He manifested a high degree of irresponsibility toward the purposes of the statutes & Executive directives prohibiting the disclosure to unauthorized persons of classified [& security] information. . . . The committee recognizes, however, that at the time in question Sen. McCarthy was under the stress & strain of being tried or investigated. . . . He offered the document in this investigation. . . . [Its contents] were relevant to the subject matter under inquiry. . . . These mitigating circumstances are such that we do not recommend censure. . . ." The Select Com. decided to keep "physical possession of this document, in confidence," and to turn it over to the FBI unless otherwise directed by the Senate.[2]

Only 3 Senators Censured

Only 3 Senators ever have been censured by the Senate. Sens. Benjamin Ryan Tillman & John Lowndes McLaurin (both D., S.C.) were censured in 1902 for "abusice & provocative language & . . . a physical altercation" on the Senate floor. Sen. Hiram Bingham (R., Conn.) was censured in 1929 for bringing the assistant to the Connecticut Mfrs. Assn. president to a closed Senate Finance Com. meeting on a tariff bill.

Category IV — Incidents Involving Abuses of Colleagues in the Senate

Charges. It was charged that McCarthy (1 & 2) "publicly ridiculed & defamed" Sens. Hendrickson & Flanders "in vulgar & base language" and (3) "unfairly accused Sens. Gillette, Monroney, Hendrickson, Hayden & Hennings of improper conduct in carrying out their Senatorial duties." All except the charge referring to Flanders were covered in the report's section on "Category I" above.

Evidence. According to the evidence: During the Army-McCarthy hearings, Flanders unexpectedly gave McCarthy notice that he intended to attack him "forthwith . . . on the Senate floor." Shortly thereafter McCarthy was asked to comment and said, "I think they should get a man with a net and take him to a good, quiet place." "On occasions prior to that time," Flanders had made "provocative speeches" about McCarthy on the Senate floor.

Conclusions. McCarthy's remarks about Flanders "were highly improper." But "they were induced by Sen. Flanders' conduct in respect to Sen. McCarthy. . . . For these reasons, the committee concludes [these] remarks . . . do not constitute a basis for censure."[3]

Category V—Incident Relating to Ralph W. Zwicker, a General Officer of the Army of United States

Charges. It was charged that McCarthy (a) "without justification . . . impugned [Zwicker's] loyalty, patriotism & character," (b) "as chairman of a committee, resorted to abusive conduct in his interrogation" of Zwicker and (c) "attacked, defamed & besmirched military heroes of the United States."

Evidence. It was charged (by McCarthy's attorney) that Maj. Gen. Kirke B. Lawton "was 'gagged' by his military superiors" when he testified about a conversation with Zwicker. But "it became clear that [Lawton's] inability to give details of [the] conversation . . . was not the result of any military secrecy order but was the result of his inability to remember any of the details of the conversation."[4]

C. George Anastos of the McCarthy Com.'s staff testified that he discussed the Maj. Irving Peress case with Zwicker by phone Jan. 22, 1954 and that Zwicker "stated that the file showed there was information that Peress & his wife was or had been a Communist and that . . . Peress had refused to answer a loyalty question-

1—see p. 310F1 2—309A1 3—310C1 4—310F2

naire.[1] . . . This testimony is in contrast with that of Gen. Zwicker that he did not give to Mr. Anastos any information contained in the Peress classified personnel file. . . ."[2]

Findings of Fact. The report reviewed Zwicker's contacts with the McCarthy Com. & McCarthy's interrogation of Zwicker.[3] During this interrogation, McCarthy told Zwicker that any man promoted to general "who says, 'I will protect another general who protected Communists,' is not fit to wear that uniform." "Gen. Zwicker did not make any such statement."[4]

McCarthy testified before the Select Com. that Zwicker "had said in effect: 'It is all right to give Communists honorable discharges.' . . . No testimony in this record . . . justifies such a conclusion."

McCarthy contended at the Select Com. hearings "that matters in the Peress personnel file could be revealed by Gen. Zwicker . . . and that Gen. Zwicker was not relying on any Presidential order. . . . Later Sen. McCarthy testified that Gen. Zwicker was relying on Presidential & Executive orders and that he, Sen. McCarthy, had copies of them."[5]

"The facts concerning Peress' Communist connections were known to Gen. Zwicker's superiors when he was directed to discharge Peress. . . . Gen. Zwicker was not responsible in any way for promoting or discharging Peress and was very much opposed to both. . . . Peress was not in a sensitive position so far as intelligence or classified information or material was concerned."[6]

Legal Questions. (1) ". . . We have concluded that Gen. Zwicker, when he appeared . . . before Sen. McCarthy on Feb. 18, 1954, was a truthful witness. . . . His examination was unfair." He "testified as fully & frankly as he could do in view of the Presidential & Army directives which restricted [him]. These directives were known to his examiners, and . . . [there] was no excuse for berating Gen. Zwicker and holding him up to . . . ridicule."

(2) "There is no evidence that Gen. Zwicker was intentionally irritating, evasive or arrogant." Roy M. Cohn's initial examination of Zwicker "was mutually courteous & satisfactory." McCarthy Com. aides Anastos & James N. Juliana found Zwicker "cooperative & helpful." Zwicker "was courteous & respectful throughout" his interrogation by McCarthy. McCarthy's "insistence" that Zwicker "answer long hypothetical questions & questions that are not clear even upon careful inspection & reflection was much more the source of any resulting irritation on the part of the examiner than any conduct on the part of the witness."

(3) ". . . There are few safeguards for the protection of the witnesses" before Congressional committees. Their treatment "usually depends & must depend upon the skill & attitude of the chairman & the members." ". . . The very fact that 'the exercise of good taste & good judgment' must be entrusted to those who conduct such investigations places upon them the responsibility of upholding the honor of the Senate. . . ."

(4) McCarthy's "conduct . . . toward Gen. Zwicker was not proper under the circumstances." McCarthy knew before questioning Zwicker that the Army Judge Advocate General, "the responsible person under the statutes, had given the opinion that a court-martial of Maj. Peress would not stand . . . and that Gen. Zwicker had been directed by higher authority to issue an honorable discharge to Peress upon his [Peress'] application." McCarthy knew Zwicker "was a loyal & outstanding officer who had devoted his life to the service of his country," was "strongly opposed to Communists & their activities," was "cooperative & helpful" to the committee staff in giving data about Peress, opposed Peress' promotion & honorable discharge and "was testifying under the restrictions of lawful Executive orders."

Conclusions. McCarthy's "conduct . . . toward Gen. Zwicker was reprehensible and . . . he should be censured by the Senate."

Charges Not Included in the Public Hearings

43 charges against McCarthy were not considered in the public hearings for one or more of these reasons:

The charges (1) even if established, would not constitute censurable conduct, (2) "would . . . be of doubtful validity as a basis for censure," (3) "are too vague & uncertain or . . . too broad in apparent scope to justify formal hearings," (4) reflected "largely personal opinion rather than delineating specific, concrete conduct," (5) "would have required more time to investigate, document & take testimony upon than was practically available," (6) "were substantially covered or duplicated by other charges," (7) concerned "statements made on the floor of the Senate about public officials . . . which, if held censurable, would tend to place unwarranted limitations on the freedom of speech in the Senate," (8) involved matters "not susceptible of satisfactory proof in this forum" such as "the receipt by a member of a committee of payments not corresponding to the value of services rendered from persons subject to the jurisdiction of such committee," (9) were "of improper treatment of a particular committee witness who is presently undergoing confidential security investigation by the Executive Dept.," (10) involved "misconduct of the staff of a standing committee of the Senate over which that committee as a whole has jurisdiction & primary responsibility," (11) concerned "matters over which other committees already acquired jurisdiction," (12) were ones "on which no substantial evidence was submitted and none could be found by the committee."[7]

Bush Amendment

Senate Res. 301 contained an amendment by Sen. Prescott Bush (R., Conn.) "in regard to proposed changes in rules & procedure for Senate committees."[8]

". . . We are of the opinion that had certain rules of committee procedure been in effect, much of the criticism against investigative committee hearings would have been avoided." The Select Com. therefore proposed a resolution to add to subsection 3 of rule XXV of the Senate Standing Rules:

"(c) No witness shall be required to testify before a committee or subcommittee with less than 2 members present" unless a majority "agrees that one member may hold the hearing or the witness waives any objection" to this.

"(d) Committee interrogation of witnesses shall be conducted only by members & authorized staff personnel of the committee and no person shall be employed or assigned to investigate activities until approved by the committee.

"(e) No testimony taken or material presented in an executive session shall be made public [in any way] unless authorized by majority vote. . . .

"(f) Vouchers covering expenditures . . . shall be accompanied by a statement signed by the chairman that the investigation was duly authorized and conducted under the provisions of this rule."

OTHER U.S. NEWS

Nixon Scored on Ouster Claim

Democratic Natl. Chrmn. Stephen A. Mitchell charged in an NBC-TV broadcast Sept. 26 that Vice Pres. Nixon told an "outright lie" in saying the Admin. had "kicked the Communists out of Govt. . . . by the thousands." This quotation was in an AP report of Nixon's remarks in Huron, S.D. Sept. 18.[9]

The AP admitted Sept. 29, on the basis of a tape recording, that it had "misquoted" Nixon, who actually said: "We're kicking the Communists & fellow-travelers & security risks out of the Govt. . . . by the thousands." He had used similar phraseology frequently in the campaign but always had included the words "security risks" when claiming "thousands" of ousters.

Mitchell said Sept. 29 that Nixon was "not being honest" and tried "to give a false impression" when he "conglomerates Communists, fellow-travelers & security risks."

Sen. Olin D. Johnston (S.C.), ranking Democrat on the Senate Civil Svc. Com., charged in Tallahassee, Fla. Sept. 30 that Nixon was attacking the Democrats with a fascist-type "big lie" technique. Johnston said Civil Svc. Comm. Chrmn. Philip Young had told his committee under oath that "he knew of no single Govt. employe who had been fired because he was a Communist" or a "fellow-traveler" but that "derogatory" information had been found in the files of 2,400 federal employes.

(The last ouster total, released in March, was 2,427 with only 383 considered potentially subversive.)[10]

Atomic Sub Commissioned

The world's first atomic-powered ship, the 3,000-ton submarine *Nautilus,* was commissioned in Groton, Conn. Sept. 30 and joined the Altantic Fleet. The 300-ft. vessel, manned by 11 officers & 85 enlisted men, was reported capable of cruising 25,000 miles

1—see p. 311E2 2—p. 310F3 3—p. 61D1 4—p. 307E1 5—p. 309D2 6—p. 311A2 7—p. 285A2 8—p. 260C3 9—p. 317A1 10—p. 69F1

(around the world) without refueling, or of crossing the Atlantic submerged at full speed (more than 20 knots).

The Navy said the *Nautilus* cost $29 million, was "designed specifically to be a killer submarine with the primary task of whittling down the Soviet submarine menace whenever this should be required."[1]

Adm. Jerauld Wright, Atlantic Fleet commander, said at commissioning ceremonies that Russia's Navy was 2d only to the U.S.' and that its undersea fleet numbered 350-400 submarines, 40% of long-range type.[2]

Ex-PWs Convicted

Lt. Col. Harry Fleming, 46, was convicted by an Army court-martial in Ft. Sheridan, Ill. Sept. 22 of collaborating with his Communist captors while a war prisoner in Korea. He was sentenced Sept. 23 to "involuntary [equivalent to dishonorable] discharge" and loss of all pay.

Cpl. Claude J. Batchelor, 22, was convicted of similar charges by an Army court-martial in Ft. Sam Houston, Tex. Sept. 30 and sentenced to life imprisonment.

The verdicts & sentences in both cases were subject to review.

Fleming Guilty on 4 Coutss

Fleming was found guilty of charges that he: (1) made propaganda broadcasts, (2 & 3) led discussion groups in which the U.S. & UN were denounced as aggressors in Korea & in which communism was lauded and (4) wrote anti-U.S., pro-Red articles for Communist publications. But he was acquitted of charges of informing on fellow PWs & of stamping on an American PW's foot.

Fleming's defense was that he participated in propaganda activities under severe duress & to aid other PWs. Ex-PW witnesses testified that he had tried to make the propaganda "harmless" and had fought to get medical aid for fellow PWs.

(Fleming told reporters Sept. 16 that "proper Army officials" had offered to let him avoid court-martial by retiring but that he refused because "I did nothing wrong.")[3]

Batchelor Ruled Sane

Batchelor's defense, in a trial which opened Aug. 30, was that he had been made temporarily insane by "brainwashing." But the court, after conflicting opinions by psychiatrists, decided that he was sane and responsible for his actions.

Batchelor was one of 23 American PWs who had elected to stay with the Communists. The court Aug. 31 rejected the plea that Batchelor had returned to the UN side on being promised immunity from prosecution. The court held that he had been granted immunity from the charge of refusing to be repatriated but not from charges of collaborating.[4]

Ex-PW Edward Dickenson, who also had changed his mind and returned to the UN side (he was serving a 10-yr. term on similar charges),[5] testified Sept. 30 that Batchelor had recommended a death sentence for Pfc. Wilburn Watson of Corinth, Miss. after the Chinese Reds accused Watson of being a spy. Batchelor denied this. Watson was not executed.

Evidence & testimony at the trial indicated that the Communists had planned to smuggle unrepatriated American PWs back into the U.S. as underground Red leaders and that Batchelor at first had been chosen by the Communists to lead a Red-front organization of repatriated PWs in the U.S. A statement by Batchelor, introduced Sept. 16, said that when Batchelor decided not to be repatriated, the Reds chose Sgt. William Skipper, 24, of Ayer, Mass. to succeed him as leader of the pro-Communist ex-PWs. But Batchelor was "not certain that he got the job."[6]

Other Cases Investigated

First Army hq. at Ft. Jay, N.Y. disclosed Sept. 23 that some ex-PWs in the First Army area were being investigated on charges relating to their captivity in Korea.

The UP reported from Chinhae, South Korea Sept. 10 (release delayed by censor until Sept. 24) that the USAF had been running a "prison camp school" in the nearby mountains since May. 150 pilots & flight nurses a month were given 6-day courses in "how to resist Communist 'brainwashing' techniques if they ever are captured."

Jury Upholds Chavez' Victory

Sen. Dennis Chavez (D., N.M.) won an honest victory over Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley (R.) when he was reelected in 1952, a federal grand jury reported in Albuquerque Sept. 24. The 22-member jury, after listening for 3 days to the FBI's report on the election, charged that most allegations of irregularities filed by Hurley & others apparently were "motivated for purely political purposes."[11]

Army to Get 5 Divisions

Army Secy. Robert T. Stevens told newsmen in Washington Sept. 29 that the Army planned to increase strength from the current 19 combat divisions to 24 during the next 2 years while at the same time cutting over-all manpower.[7] He said this would be possible by increasing efficiency and transferring men from non-combat to combat units. (Army manpower was scheduled to drop from 1,409,500 at the beginning of this fiscal year to 1,173,000 at its end.)

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Army Chief of Staff, attended the briefing and admitted that, "as a cold, practical matter, we will still have 17 effective divisions."

Stevens disclosed a new rotation plan, Operation Gyroscope, to start next summer, under which overseas service would be on a divisional rather than individual basis. Divisions would serve 33 months abroad & 31 months in the U.S. Draftees would train for 6 months in the U.S., serve overseas for 17 months, spend a month in transit. The Army hoped this plan would build organizational pride, spur reenlistment and result in greater efficiency.

Ridgway said the Army would keep 9 divisions overseas—5 in Europe, 3 in the Far East, one in Hawaii.[8]

Stevens & Ridgway had presented their strength plan to Pres. Eisenhower in Denver Sept. 28. Ridgway told newsmen then that atomic war would require more rather than fewer soldiers because entire units could be wiped out and greater battlefield depth & more dispersion of supplies would be needed.

Boycott Blocks Desegregation

11 Negroes registered in high school in Milford, Del. were removed from the enrollment records Sept. 30 after a boycott of classes by white students and resignation of the Milford Board of Education, which had authorized Negro enrollment. The Negroes were dropped by a new board formed as a result of talks in which Gov. J. Caleb Boggs participated.[9]

(The Supreme Court's barring of segregation in public schools did not preclude "reasonable segregation" of white & Negro passengers on interstate private carriers, ICC examiner Isadore Freirson ruled in Washington Sept. 30.)

Steel Merger Held Illegal

Atty. Gen. Herbert Brownell Jr., speaking in New York Sept. 30, announced that Justice Dept. attorneys believed a proposed merger of Bethlehem Steel & Youngstown Sheet & Tube would violate anti-trust laws. But he said the Eisenhower Admin. would support at next session of Congress an effort to modify a 1950 amendment of the anti-trust law under which the Bethlehem-Youngstown & possibly many other pending business mergers now would be held illegal.[10]

OBITUARIES

Bert Lytell, 69, stage, screen & radio-TV actor; Sept. 28 in N.Y.

Sen. Pat (Patrick Anthony) McCarran, 78, U.S. Sen. (D.) from Nevada since 1932; Sept. 28 in Hawthorne, Nev. of heart attack just after he had made a political address. (McCarran, as chrmn. of Senate Judiciary Com., set up its Internal Security Subcom. in 1951 and co-sponsored with Rep. Francis E. Walter [D., Pa.] the McCarran-Walter immigration & nationality act of 1952. He was an attorney, Nevada Supreme Court Justice 1913-18, often opposed to FDR & Truman policies during Democratic Admins. His death reduced Dem. membership in the Senate to 46 as against 48 Rep., one ind.)[12]

James Howell Street, 50, novelist (*The Gauntlet, Tap Roots*, other best-sellers); Sept. 28 in Chapel Hill, N.C. of heart attack.

Maximilian von Weichs, 72, field marshal & Southeast Europe Supreme Commander in World War II German Army; Sept. 27 near Bonn.

1—see p. 31G1 2—p. 284B2 3—285F3 4—Vol. XIII, 426A2 5—p. 151D1 6—75A2 7—211G1 8—282E3 9—319D3 10—262D3 11—93F1 12—see Indexes to Vols. I-XIV for references.

SPORTS

Giants, Indians in Series

The NL New York Giants won the first 2 games of the World Series in New York Sept. 29-30 from the AL Cleveland Indians. Scores:

First game Sept. 28 (attendance 52,751):

	R.	H.	E.	Pitchers	Catchers
Clev.	2	8	0	Lemon	Hegan, Grass
N.Y.	5	9	3	Maglie, Liddle, Grissom (winner)	Westrum

N.Y. pinchhitter Jim (Dusty) Rhodes hit winning 3-run homer in 10th inning. Vic Wertz of Cleve. hit triple, double, 2 singles, but Willie center in 8th saved game for Giants.

Second game Sept. 30 (attendance 49,099):

	R.	H.	E.	Pitchers	Catchers
Cleve.	1	8	0	Wynn (lost), Mossi	Hegan
N.Y.	3	4	0	Antonelli	Westrum

Rhodes singled in tying run for N.Y. as pinchhitter in 5th, remained in game & homered in 7th. Al Smith homered in first for Cleve.

Cleveland, managed by Al Lopez, ended the N.Y. Yankees' 5-yr. tenure as AL & World Series champions by winning the AL title with a league-record total of 111 victories. The Giants, managed by Leo Durocher, ended Brooklyn's 2-yr. NL supremacy.[1]

Attendance at major league games this season totaled 15,937,282 (paid) for a 10.8% increase over last year's 14,383,797, UP reported Sept. 26. NL attendance rose 7.1% to 8,015,837, the AL by 13.8% to 7,921,445. Milwaukee set a NL record of 2,131,388 for one club's home attendance.

Charles (Chuck) Dressen, 56, Oakland mgr. in the Pacific Coast League this year, signed a 2-yr. contract Sept. 27 at an estimated $35,000-$40,000-a-yr. to replace Stanley (Bucky) Harris as Washington mgr. in the AL.[2] . . . **Ted Williams,** 36, star Boston (AL) leftfielder, announced Sept. 26 his retirement as a player. He had compiled a batting avg. of .348 over 12 seasons. He hit .345 in 117 games this year after recovering from a spring-training injury.[3] . . . **Karl Spooner,** 23, Brooklyn rookie lefthand pitcher from Ft. Worth of the Texas League, set a record for a pitcher making his major league debut when he struck out 15 batters in defeating the N.Y. Giants, 3-0, in Brooklyn Sept. 22. He then struck out 12 men Sept. 26 in defeating Pittsburgh, 1-0, to set a new NL record for strikeouts in consecutive games. He tied the NL record for shutouts in initial starts by a rookie. . . . **Louisville** won the Amer. Assn. final playoff Sept. 26 by 4 games to one over Indianapolis.[4]

FINAL STANDINGS SEPT. 26

NATIONAL LEAGUE	W.	L.	Pct.	GB	AMERICAN LEAGUE	W.	L.	Pct.	GB
N.Y.	97	57	.630	—	Clev.	111	43	.721	—
Bklyn.	92	62	.597	5	N.Y.	103	51	.669	8
Milw.	89	65	.578	8	Chic.	94	60	.610	17
Phil.	75	79	.487	22	Bost.	69	85	.448	42
Cinc.	74	80	.481	23	Detr.	68	86	.442	43
St.L.	72	82	.468	25	Wash.	66	88	.429	45
Chic.	64	90	.416	33	Balt.	54	100	.351	57
Pitt.	53	101	.344	44	Phil.	51	103	.331	60

INDIVIDUAL LEADERS

BATTING

National League	A.B.	Hits	Pct.
Willie Mays, New York	565	195	.345
Don Mueller, New York	619	212	.342
Duke Snider, Brooklyn	584	199	.341
Stan Musial, St. Louis	591	195	.330
Ted Kluszewski, Cinci.	573	187	.326
Red Schoendienst, St. L.	610	192	.315
Richie Ashburn, Phila.	559	175	.313
Pee Wee Reese, Bklyn.	554	171	.309
Joe Adcock, Milw.	500	154	.308
John Temple, Cinci.	505	155	.307
Gil Hodges, Brooklyn	579	176	.304
Wally Moon, St. Louis	635	193	.304
American League			
Bobby Avila, Cleveland	555	189	.341
Minnie Minoso, Chicago	568	182	.320
Nelson Fox, Chicago	631	201	.319
Irv Noren, New York	426	136	.319
Yogi Berra, New York	584	179	.307
Harvey Kuenn, Detroit	656	201	.306
Bill Goodman, Boston	489	148	.303
Andy Carey, New York	412	124	.301
Mickey Mantle, New York	543	163	.300
Jim Finigan, Phila.	487	146	.300
Al Rosen, Cleveland	466	140	.300

Home Runs

National—Kluszewski 49, Hodges 42, Mays 41, Hank Sauer (Chi.) 41, Snider 40, Ed Mathews (Milw.) 40, Musial 35, Jim Greengrass (Cinci.) 27, Henry Thompson (N.Y.) 26, Del Ennis (Phila.) 25, Adcock 23, Frank Thomas (Pitts.) 23, Ralph Kiner (Chi.) 22. **American**—Larry Doby (Cleve.) 32, Ted Williams (Bost.) 29, Mantle 27, Jackie Jensen (Bost.) 25, Rosen 24, Roy Seivers (Washn.) 24, Berra 22.

Runs Batted In

National—Kluszewski 141, Hodges 130, Snider 130, Musial 126, Del Ennis (Phila.) 126. **American**—Doby 126, Berra 125.

Pitching

National	W.	L.	American	W.	L.
*Antonelli, N.Y.	21	7	Lemon, Clev.	23	7
Spahn, Milw.	21	12	Wynn, Clev.	23	11
Roberts, Phil.	23	15	Grim, N.Y.	20	6
			*Consuegra, Chi.	16	3

*League pct. leaders among pitchers having at least 15 decisions (Antonelli .800, Consuegra .842).

Other Winners

FOOTBALL SCORES

Natl. League (Pro.) Sept. 26

Det. 48, Chi. Bears 23	N.Y. 41, Chi. Cards 10
Phila. 28, Cleve. 10	Los Ang. 48, Balti. 0
S.Fran. 41, Washn. 7	Pittsb. 21, G.Bay 20

College Sept. 25

Alabama 12, LSU 0	Notre Dame 21, Tex. 0
Ariz. 54, Utah 20	N'west'n 27, Ia. St. 14
Arkansas 41, Tulsa 0	Ohio St. 28, Ind. 0
Auburn 45, Chatnga. 0	Okla. 21, TCU 16
Baylor 25, Vandblt. 19	Okla.A&M 14, Tex.AM 6
Bost. C. 12, Detrt. 7	Ore. St. 13, Idaho 0
Brown 18, Columbia 7	Penn St. 14, Ill. 12
Calif. 45, S. Jose 0	Prnctn. 10, Rutgers 8
Colgate 19, Cornell 14	Purdue 31, Mo. 0
Colo. 46, Colo. A&M 0	SC 34, Army 20
Drtmth. 27, H.Cross 26	Syracuse 28, VInva. 6
Duke 52, Penn 0	Stanford 18, Ore. 13
Fla. 13, Ga. Tech 12	Tenn. 19, Miss. St. 7
Georgia 14, Clemson 7	Tulane 13, Memphis 13
Ia. 14, Mich. St. 10	UCLA 32, Kansas 7
Kan. St. 21, Wyo. 13	Va. 27, Lehigh 21
Miami 51, Furman 13†	VMI 16, G.Wash. 14
Mich. 14, Wash. 0	VPI 32, Wake For. 0
Minn. 19, Nebr. 7	Wash.St. 18, Col.Pac. 0
Miss. 28, Ky. 9	Wayne 13, Lvl. 0†
Navy 27, W&M 0	Wisc. 52, Marqt. 14
NC 20, NC St. 6	Yale 27, Conn. 0

Golf. $40,000 World Series tourney in Washington: won Sept. 26 by Marty Furgol of Lemont, Ill., for $7,500. . . . Ardmore (Okla.) women's open: won Sept. 26 by Patty Berg of Chicago for $2,000 (first prize & bonuses).

Horse Racing. $67,500 United Nations Handicap at Atlantic City Sept. 25: won by Jaclyn Stable's Closed Door, Bill Hartack up, for $50,000. . . . $69,300 Little Brown Jug harness racing pace at Delaware, O.: won Sept. 23 by Howard Lyons' Adios Harry, Morrie McDonald driving, for $23,395.

Russia clinched the international chess team tournament championship in Amsterdam Sept. 23.[5] . . . **Tom Parks,** 31, swam Catalina Channel (Emerald Bay, Catalina I. to Palos Verdes, Calif.) in record time of 13 hr. 25 min. 31 sec. Sept. 23.[6] . . . **George Mikan,** 30, who scored 10,963 pts. in 7 seasons as center on the NBA Minneapolis Lakers, announced his retirement from basketball Sept. 24 to practice law in Minneapolis.[7]

MISCELLANEOUS

Disasters

An estimated 1,567 persons died due to ship sinkings, floods, landslides & fires during a typhoon in Japan Sept. 26-27. Greatest single disaster: loss of an estimated 1,168 lives when the ferryboat *Toya Maru* capsized Sept. 26 off Hokkaido Island.

At least 80 persons were reported killed Sept. 28 when a train fell through a flood-weakened bridge & into a river 50 mi. east of Hyderabad, India. 46 fatalities were reported from flash floods caused by a 16.32-in. rain in Lahore, Pakistan Sept. 24.

29 persons were killed Sept. 25 when a jet-plane fuel tank exploded near a U.S. guided missile base at Bitburg, West Germany.

Crime News

4 prisoners were killed and 30 prisoners & 3 guards injured during a 15-hr. uprising Sept. 22-23 by about 300 inmates who tried to break out of Missouri State Penitentiary in Jefferson City. No prisoners escaped. The rioters caused $3-5 million damage to prison buildings & equipment. . . . 1,300 prisoners in Bridewell city prison in Chicago staged a 3-hr. riot Sept. 25 demanding better food.

Steven Goldberg, 4, & his babysitter, Lynn Ann Smith, 14, were found stabbed to death Sept. 25 in the Goldberg home in Springfield, Mass. . . . James T. Roberts, Baltimore attorney & labor leader, surrendered to arrest in Baltimore Sept. 27 under an indictment in Miami on charges that he & 2 unidentified persons murdered his daughter Judith Ann, 7, last July 7. He denied the charge.[8] . . . George W. Rogers, 55, the heroic radio operator on the liner *Morro Castle* when it burned & sank off New Jersey in 1934, was sentenced to life imprisonment in Jersey City Sept. 24 for the murders (with motive of robbery) of William Hummell, 83, & his daughter Edith, 58.

FBI Dir. J. Edgar Hoover reported Sept. 22 that major crimes committed in the U.S. during Jan.-June this year totaled 1,136,140, an increase of 88,850 or 8½% over first-half 1953.[9]

●

Diego Rivera, muralist, was readmitted to membership in the Mexican Communist Party Sept. 26. He had been expelled as a Trotskyite in 1929.[10]

Married: Actress Audrey Hepburn, 25, to actor-director Mel (Melchor G.) Ferrer, 37; Sept. 25 in Burgenstock, Switzerland (his 4th marriage).[11]

†Sept. 24 1—see p. 231G3 2—Vol. XIII, 328E1 3—XIII, 360G2; IX, 344P 4—p. 312G2 5—220A2 6—Vol. XII, 308F 7—XIII, 175M 8—p. 248E3 9—237D1 10—270G3 11—pp. 102B3, 63G2